

# IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

|                       |               |                 |         |
|-----------------------|---------------|-----------------|---------|
| In re Application of: | Gary Peterson | Confirm. No.    | 7301    |
| Serial No.:           | 10/691,591    | Group Art Unit: | 2875    |
| Filed:                | 10/24/2003    | Examiner        |         |
| For:                  | Bike Light    | Attorney Docket | 810-001 |

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

## PETITION TO REVIVE 37 CFR 1.137 (b)

Dear Sir:

Applicant unintentionally allowed this application to go abandoned. See attached letter from applicant, Gary Peterson.

Applicant hereby requests revival and includes payment through the electronic funds transfer in the amount of \$750.00.

Respectfully Submitted,



Date: \_\_\_\_\_

2/27/07

Rick Martin  
Reg. No. 32,267  
Patent Law Offices of Rick Martin, P.C.  
416 Coffman Street  
Longmont, CO 80501  
Phone 303-651-2177  
Fax 303-678-9953

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RE: Application of Gary Peterson Serial No.: 10691591  
Filed: October 24, 2003 For: Bike Light  
Attorney Docket: 810-0011

**Reinstatement of Patent Application**

Dear Sir:

I am writing this letter to respectfully request reinstatement of the above mentioned patent application. There are a number of issues that have contributed to missing the response date and they are in no particular order:

1) My business partner, who was working with me and our former patent attorney, has been unable to commit any substantial time to help resolve the issues raised by the examiner or to assist me or our former attorney in that attempt due to his wife's breast cancer and the prolonged treatment required for her recovery. She was diagnosed in early March of 2006 and completed treatment in September of 2006. During that time he was also involved with his attorneys in the day to day litigation of a frivolous lawsuit filed against him and a company he had worked for. I relied on him and the attorney to help resolve the patent application issues and made every consideration possible to him because of the gravity of his situation.

2) Communication with our former attorney regarding his attempts to resolve the claim rejection issues has been unsatisfactory. On his recommendation, I filed an amendment on June 6, 2005 believing that it would protect my pending patent and a number of the claims. That filing was unsuccessful. I received a notice from him in May 2006 regarding his recommendation and the costs for filing another amendment. Over several months we discussed the issues and time frames. Disappointed with his recommendations, I decided to find another attorney that was not 1,700 miles away. I believed having a local attorney would help resolve the communication issues and better handle the patent application issues. I was told that it would cost more to reinstate the patent than to file extensions but I needed someone local with the patent expertise that I could rely on and sit down and talk with.


3) The time spent reviewing the application and the rejected claims and then searching for a local and qualified patent attorney also delayed filing the amendment before the required time. In late September my business partner returned to assisted me in finding our current attorney.

Thank you for your time and consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

Gary Peterson

I hereby certify under penalty of perjury that the above statements are true and accurate.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Gary Peterson

12-14-06  
Date